

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In response to the last Office Action (February 9, 2006) as to the failure to distinctly claim the subject matter and for not being in one sentence form I have amended the claims accordingly.

In reviewing *Sowrys*' patent I was able to discern a tremendous difference between what *Sowry*'s invention and mine in both form and function. *Sowry* invented an apparatus he describes as a grip, that can be placed over the handle of an existing tool rendering it buoyant. He explicitly states that he does not want to change the characteristics of a tool, thus making that tool weaker. This grip is designed to fit over that tool to enable it to be buoyant. The grip is not a tool. The grip does not render the tool to be non-corrosive. The grip is reflective, not the tool. Your use of inference here should not be applicable for this reason.

Visser as you stated is a pair of pliers. My invention is a wrench. Your use of inference here should not be applicable for this reason.

My invention is a tool, in and of itself. My main concern was buoyancy, reflectivity and corrosion resistance.. The entire tool is buoyant. It will be a weaker tool than one made of steel. But it will not corrode. My tool is a wrench. It can unscrew bolts. In my multi-tool design it can screw in screws, do light hammering and with a marlinspike splice rope. My claim separates itself for *Frazzle* in it's non-corrosiveness

and reflectivity. I now further disassociated from *Frazzle* by inventing a tool with the addition of having a pleasant taste if held orally.

CONCLUSION

My invention is unique in that it is buoyant, non-corrosive, reflective and tasteful wrench. It should be patentable for this reason.

The examiner is invited to contact me to discuss any matters pertaining to this present application. If there are any resubmitting fees please let me know and I will forward you a check.

Sincerely,



Bradley Birns

Submitted by: 
Bradley Birns
2825 Morning Glory Lane
Davie, Florida 33328
Tel.: (954) 424-1256